

EVALUATION FORM
Alameda Main Library (1008)

Population Growth - 1980 to 2020

FORM AA

Regulatory Basis: p.35, 20440, Appendix 1

Rating Panel Comments

+25%

EVALUATION FORM
Alameda Main Library (1008)

Age of Existing Library

FORM A

Regulatory Basis: p.37, 20440, Appendix 1

Rating Panel Comments

There is no existing library.

Rating Basis:

4 = No Existing Facility

3 = 1957 or older

2 = 1958-1962

1 = 1963-1974

0 = 1975-Present

RATING:

Date of Most Recent Structural Renovation

Rating Basis:

4 = No Renovation

3 = 1957 or older

2 = 1958-1962

1 = 1963-1974

0 = 1975-Present

RATING: *Not applicable*

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Community Library Needs Assessment

FORM F

RATING:

Regulatory Basis: p.26, 20440 (d) (2) and p.61, 20440, Appendix 3

Rating Panel Comments

Exceptionally well done. All interest groups of community involved in process, e.g., parents of homeschoolers, disabled, seniors, private school parents and teachers, residents, K-12 population and school district, businesses, and non-English speaking population.

Thorough discussion of needs of students/teachers in public and private schools, homeschoolers, pre-schoolers, and impact of multi-cultural and ethnic populations.

Needs Assessment is well documented and the demographic information is extensive. Ties in with Plan of Service and Joint Use Agreement.

The needs assessment demonstrates a thorough examination of the community, including a wide variety of methods for residents to participate in the process.

Rating Basis:

1. Methodology & Community Involvement.
2. Community Analysis/Community agencies & organizations, service area.
demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics.
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable).
5. Space Needs Assessment.
6. Needs of K-12 Student Population, if applicable.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
4	Not applicable			
5	4	4	4	4
6	4	3	4	4
Totals	20 4.0	19 3.8	20 4.0	20 4.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Library Plan of Service

FORM G

Regulatory Basis: p.67, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Well designed joint venture - staffing, resources, grade level considerations for formal learning support for K-6 and K-12. Advisory Youth Council and Teen Council, as well as SAT Pre Study Hall have active continuing roles in program.

All needs identified are addressed with well planned implementation programs.

Good Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment.

The plan responds very well to the needs identified in the needs assessment. It is clear that the applicant considered needs of all residents before deciding that a joint use project was needed. It is also clear that the applicant designed services for all clienteles, including homeschoolers, private school students, and adult learners of all ages.

Rating Basis

- 1.How Project responds to Needs of Residents.
- 2.How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented.
- 3.Types of services well documented.
- 4.How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4	4
Totals	16 4.0	16 4.0	16 4.0	16 4.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Library Building Program

FORM H

Regulatory Basis: p.69, 20440, Appendix 5

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Is consistent with Needs Assessment and Plan of Service. Area descriptions are excellent.

Building Program meets our requirements but lacks real connection with Needs Assessment and Plan of Service.

The building program was developed in keeping with the needs assessment. It is well organized and carefully detailed. An improvement would be to augment the spatial relationship bubble diagram with a verbal description.

Rating Basis:

- 1.How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
- 2.How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
- 3.How well are the Spatial Relationships described.
- 4.How well are individual spaces sized and described.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	3	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	3
4	3	4	4	4
Totals	15 3.8	15 3.8	16 4.0	15 3.8

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Conceptual Plans

FORM I

Regulatory Basis: p.27, 20440 (d) (5)

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Non-assignable square footage is totaled for project on each floor - not by area.

Not all adjacencies specified in the building program were achieved (e.g., periodicals is not adjacent to the reference desk; young adult homework center is not adjacent to the reference desk; etc.), and the square footage of some spaces were reduced from those specified in the building program (e.g., copy alcove reduced from 152 SF to 92 SF; technical services storage area reduced from 400 SF to 250 SF; adult non-fiction from 5,864 SF to 4,903 SF; etc.). From building program to conceptual plans, the assignable square footage was reduced by approximately 1,000 square feet. There is no access to the front entrance from the library parking, which is a detriment for clientele accompanied by children or who are carrying library materials.

Rating Basis:

- 1.How well the net-assignable square footage on plan matches BP, PoS and NA
- 2.How well the non-assignable square footage on plan matches BP, PoS and NA
- 3.How well Spatial Relationships on plan match what was called for in BP, PoS, and NA
- 4.How well the elevations, sections and specification implement the BP and PoS

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	2
2	2	4	4	2
3	2	4	4	2
4	2	4	3	2
Totals	10	16	15	8
	2.5	4.0	3.8	2.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

FORM J

Regulatory Basis: p.60, 20440, Appendix 2

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

There is a sustainable program described in the agreement. Appendices detail equitable staffing, resource contributions, whether in-kind or actual. There is no mention of a review process. However, in the appendices, quarterly meetings between District and Public Library staff are mentioned as an additional in-place partnering venture.

Exhibit 1 listing the joint venture projects is well done. The list of collaborative projects in addition to Exhibit 1 is a good addition to this application. Two collaborative projects which stand out are 1) bus passes for students, and 2) foreign language translation and outreach.

The joint use agreement demonstrates a well thought-out response to needs of the clientele served mutually by both entities. While there is no specific financial commitment, the commitment to the services and requisite staffing is evident. The agreement could be clearer in some areas. For example, it mentions specific job titles for those from both the school district and the public library who will be involved in the joint venture project, but not the number of hours devoted to the joint venture aspects. The agreement embraces more than just a single component, including a network of services that respond to the goals of both agencies in filling the needs of the students.

Rating Basis:

1. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
2. How clearly are the joint library services described.
3. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
4. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
5. How well are ownership issues resolved.
6. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
7. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process.
8. How well the agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long term partnership.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
4	3	4	4	3
5	4	4	3	4
6	3	4	4	3
7	2	4	4	2
8	4	4	4	4
Totals	28	32	31	28
	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.5

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Joint Use: Needs of K-12 Students

FORM K

Regulatory Basis: p.67, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Technology Planning - incorporates WANs, LANs, proxied network connectivity to electronic and digital resources for students using Homework Center, ensuring compatibility with School District resources and services as well.

A large part of the needs of the residents, and specifically of the K-12 students, is directly responded to by incorporation of not only technology, but networked technology that enables the library and school district to serve the students' needs better jointly than either could do individually.

Rating Basis:

1. How the project responds to the needs of the K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment.
2. How well the mission, roles, goals and objectives are documented.
3. How well documented are the types of K-12 services.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
Totals	12	12	12	12
	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Integration of Electronic Technologies

FORM L

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Wireless technology incorporated value engineering approach - plan is detailed and well communicated. There are also smart podiums and presentation systems. Needs of disabled included - Arkenstone and Kurzewell with voice recognition equipment - special computer center with motorized adjustments. Technology Plan addresses needs identified in Needs Assessment. Equipment and its uses are well defined.

Technology is incorporated throughout the planning documents, not as an end in itself but to solve service needs in the most responsive ways possible. Flexibility is stressed to enable the library to adopt new technologies as they develop.

Rating Basis:

1. Appropriateness of the electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment.
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Plan of Service.
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is in the Building Program.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
Totals	12 4.0	12 4.0	12 4.0	12 4.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Appropriateness of Site

FORM M

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

Site is centrally located within the service area and a key component of the downtown revitalization planning. Access by automobile, bicycle, pedestrian and public transportation is present. Bicycle use is encouraged by the city's Bicycle Master Plan and fostered by the library, which is providing more bicycle parking than is required by the plan. Location of the library near a retail center will allow clientele to maximize "trip taking" and reduces the overall parking demand.

Site is too small for parking or future expansion. Most parking is on the street.

Rating Basis:

1. Equal Access for all residents in Service Area.
2. Accessibility via Public Transit.
3. Accessibility via Pedestrian and Bicycle.
4. Accessibility via Automobile.
5. Adequacy of Automobile Parking.
6. Adequacy of Bicycle Parking.
7. Overall Parking Rationale.
8. Shared Parking Agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site and proposed library building in service area.
10. How well site fits community context and planning.
11. Site selection process and summary.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4	4
5	4	2	4	4
6	4	3	4	4
7	2	2	4	4
8	Not applicable			
9	4	3	4	4
10	4	3	4	4
11	4	3	4	4
Totals	38	32	40	40
	3.8	3.2	4.0	4.0

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Alameda Main Library (1008)

Site Description

FORM N

Regulatory Basis: p. 45, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING:

Rating Panel Comments

While site is restricted in size and cannot accommodate an expansion, the systemwide plan calls for construction of an additional branch rather than the expansion of the main library.

Will be a key component in downtown revitalization.

Rating Basis:

1. Adequacy of size of site.
2. Drainage problems.
3. Geotechnical problems.
4. Appropriateness of site configuration (Boundary Survey)
5. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area. (Visual Record)
6. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

	R1	R2	R3	R4	
1	4	2	4	3	
2					OK
3					OK
4	4	3	4	3	
5	4	3	4	4	
6	4	2	4	4	
Totals	16	10	16	14	
	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	

EVALUATION FORM
Alameda Main Library (1008)

Financial Capacity

FORM O

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.

EVALUATION FORM
Alameda Main Library (1008)
Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		25%
Age and Condition	4.0	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes